

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 29, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-28 have been canceled. New claims 29-56 have been added. Claims 29-56 are now pending. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks provided herein below and withdrawal of the present rejections are respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 2 and 3.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims thereby rendering the objection moot.

On page 2, claims 1-28 were objected to because of the informalities: The Office Action states that with respect to claims 1, 7, 13, 19 and 25-28, "the error recovery" should be changed to "the error recovery instruction" because "the error recovery" lacks antecedent basis. With respect to claim 27, "the timer" in line 5 should be changed to "a timer" because the limitation "the timer" lacks antecedent basis.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims thereby rendering the objection moot.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states that claim 13 recites the limitation "the timer" in line 3 and there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims thereby rendering the rejection moot.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-15, 18-21 and 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mito et al. The Office Action states that Mito et al. disclose receiving an error recovery instruction. Mito discloses receiving an interrupt (see Fig. 4 and column 8 lines 36-37). The Office Action states that Mito et al. also disclose beginning a timeout task using a watchdog timer (see Fig. 4 item 172 and column 8 lines 36-37). Next, the Office Action states that Mito et al. disclose monitoring processor status to determine a time to perform the error recovery instruction. More specifically, the Office Action states that Mito et al. disclose monitoring for interrupts to initiate a suspend routine (see Fig. 4 and column 8 lines 25-30 and 45-47). Next, the Office Action states that Mito et al. disclose performing the error recovery instruction when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery by initiating a suspend routine (see column 8 lines 45-47).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims and added new claims 29-56. Applicants respectfully submit that Mito et al. fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in the new claims.

Mito et al. merely disclose a power management processor that provides an interrupt to the main processor when a power management functions needs to be performed. A hardware or software interrupt causes the processor to save its state of execution via a context switch, and begin execution of an interrupt handler for issuing a suspend signal to the processor. In response to the suspend signal, all power to the system is turned off.

Accordingly, Mito et al. does not monitor a processor interface to identify processor status for determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction. Mito et al. also fails to determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor. Further, Mito et al. also fails to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding

access to the local processor when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery instruction

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 29, 35, 41, 47 and 53-56 are patentable over Mito et al.

On page 9 of the Office Action, claims 7 10-12, 19, 22-24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanrahan et al. The Office Action states that Hanrahan et al disclose receiving an error recovery instruction, i.e., a quiesce signal (see column 9, lines 13-14). The Office Action states that Hanrahan et al. disclose monitoring processor status to determine a time to perform the error recovery instruction by sequencing to a known state when all current operations that have been started finish (see column 9, lines 20-22). Next, the Office Action states that Hanrahan et al. disclose performing the error recovery instruction when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery by sequencing to a known state for retry. recover. and debug operations (see column 2 lines 24-26).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims and added new claims 29-56. Applicants respectfully submit that Mito et al. fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in the new claims.

According to Hanrahan et al., a processing system includes an I/O control processing unit having an instruction processing unit for processing system I/O instructions and a bus arbiter for controlling priority in information transfer on a shared bus. In response to a system error indication, instruction processing unit operations are suspended in a known state. The processor, upon receiving an error indication, completes the current operation and is cycled to a known state before the stopping of system clocks.

However, Hanrahan et al. does not monitor a processor interface to identify processor

status for determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction. Hanrahan et al. also fails to determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor. Further, Hanrahan et al. also fails to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery instruction

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 29, 35, 41, 47 and 53-56 are patentable over Mito et al.

On page 14 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13-18, 20, 21, 25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanrahan in view of Kahle et al. The Office Action states that Hanrahan et al. discloses all of the claim limitations except for beginning a timeout task, which the Office Action states Kahle et al. disclose (see column 6, lines 40-45).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims and added new claims 29-56. Applicants respectfully submit that Hanrahan et al. and Kahle et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in the new claims.

As described above, Hanrahan et al. fail to suggest monitoring a processor interface to identify processor status for determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction. Hanrahan et al. also fails to suggest determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor. Further, Hanrahan et al. also fails to suggest performing the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery instruction. The Office Action also admits that Hanrahan et al. fails to disclose beginning a timeout task.

Kahle et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hanrahan et al. Kahle et al. merely

describes a hang detection unit. As with Hanrahan et al., Kahle et al. fails to suggest monitoring a processor interface to identify processor status for determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction. Kahle et al. also fails to suggest determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor. Further, Kahle et al. also fails to suggest performing the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery instruction. The Office Action also admits that Hanrahan et al. fails to disclose beginning a timeout task.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 29, 35, 41, 47 and 53-56 are patentable over Mito et al.


Dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 29, 35, 41 and 47, respectively. Further dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204